

DEC 6 1944

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 38, NO. 7

November 20, 1944

WHOLE NO. 1008

## REVIEWS

OLDFATHER, CHERF, COREY, McNEIL, STROUT, CATTERALL, STEINER, JAMESON, *Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae Patrum (Jones)*; GRIFFITHS, *Temple Treasures. Study Based on the Works of Cicero and the Fasti of Ovid (Ryberg)*; GRINNELL, *Greek Temples (Harland)*

## LATIN IN PEACE AND WAR.....

War puts a premium on disciplinary subjects like Latin. Drill is vital in war, and drill in the orderly inflections of a kindred language like Latin affords the best promise to the young pupil of mastery of his native English.

The following well-tested series covers the best recommendations for the high school course:—

**FIRST YEAR LATIN** by Smith-Thompson

**LATIN WORKBOOK** by Thompson-Peters

**SECOND YEAR LATIN** by Scudder

**THIRD YEAR LATIN** by Kelsey-Meinecke

**FOURTH YEAR LATIN** by Carlisle-Richardson

**CLASSICAL MYTHS** by Herzberg

covers every allusion to mythology which occurs in the Latin Series.

## ALLYN AND BACON

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell (In the Service: Jotham Johnson, Lionel Casson)

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 38 contains issues dated: October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18 (1944); January 8, 15, 22; February 5, 12, 26; March 5, 12, 19; April 9, 16, 23; May 14, 21; June 4 (1945).

## REVIEWS

**Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae Patrum.** By John Frank Cherf, Katherine Tubbs Corey, Sister Mary Donald McNeil, Ruth French Strout, John Leslie Catterall, Grundy Steiner and Harriet Clara Jameson. Edited by WILLIAM ABBOTT OLDFATHER, with the assistance of Sister Mary Donald McNeil, Leslie Dent Johnston, John Leslie Catterall, Grundy Steiner, Harris Livingston Russell and S. Byron Straw. xi, 566 pages, endpaper facsimiles. University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1943 \$14.50

In the religion and learning of the fourth century Jerome formed the connecting link between Occidental Rome and Oriental Chalcis, Bethlehem, and Constantinople. Though Eastern monasticism was actually introduced into Rome before his birth, the Western world did not acquire an intimate knowledge of the principles and practices of ascetic life until it assimilated his biographies of the three hermit saints, Paul of Thebes, Hilarion of Gaza, and the Syrian Malchus. The studies in the present volume consider the text tradition of these three biographies—the manuscripts of the Latin originals, of the Greek versions, and of the other versions derived from the Greek—and lay the foundation for a projected critical edition of these Vitae in the Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Oldfather and his collaborators have listed 523 extant codices of the Vitae in Latin, 234 in Greek, three in Coptic, fourteen in Syriac, four in Old Slavic,

two in Armenian, five in Arabic, and one in Ethiopic. They have assembled rotographs or photographs for 123 of the Latin MSS and for over 100 of the MSS in other languages<sup>2</sup> and have secured information regarding the remainder from transcripts, texts, collations, sample readings, and reports of one sort or another. They have collated all MSS through the eleventh century, a considerable number (but less than half) of those from the twelfth, and only occasional specimens from the subsequent centuries. They have ignored as untrustworthy most of the vernacular versions of Western Europe.<sup>3</sup> It is unlikely that they have overlooked any material of first importance, though small scraps of evidence are of course bound to come to light later. The handling of a Herculean task has been both thorough and conscientious.

The knowledge of textual criticism displayed and the methods used are in general beyond criticism. There are, however, occasional minor lapses. Thus, there is ample reason to doubt the existence of at least four of the hypothetical MSS marked x in the stemma on page 68 and of three of those marked in the stemma on page 451. Again, it is hard to see why "Insular influence . . . seems to have been the strongest" (72) in A when MS 56, which represents one of its two branches, has "abbreviations . . . in almost every instance Continental" (68). It is similarly hard to understand why "D was probably written . . . at Canterbury" (77) when the provenience of MS 53, which represents one half of the tradition, is unknown and its writing merely dubbed "Insular." Finally, on pages 291-2 (see also 304) the variant *quae sunt eius* (for *quae possidet*, in Luke 14:33)—a variant shared by S and the African Old

<sup>1</sup>A. S. Pease first suggested that a critical edition be undertaken at Illinois. Julius Koch of Marburg, who had begun such an edition independently, was induced by ill health to bequeath his study to F. Husner of Zuos, Switzerland. Husner, in turn, relinquished his part in the work and sent Koch's material to W. A. Oldfather. The preliminary work of collecting and collating MSS was begun in 1923 at Illinois by Clement Hrdlicka.

<sup>2</sup>Twenty sets are now deposited in the Library of Congress and the rest in the Library of the University of Illinois.

<sup>3</sup>The worthlessness of the vernacular translations of Avianus has influenced the editors here.

Latin Bible—does not necessarily "indicate familiarity on the part of the scribe of S with the African version"; as the authors are themselves aware, it is probably due to the inaccurate quotation from memory of a verse well known in monastic circles.

A peculiar mistake occurs on page 475. The authors state: "The extreme freedom of editing in R suggests strongly that a competent Irish scholar . . . had a great deal to do with creating it." They offer as evidence the competence of the general emendation and the fact that MS 9, the oldest representative of R, "comes from a distinctly Irish center of culture." Yet on page 469 the provenience of MS 9 is listed as "Werden (?)" and on pages 470-1 is the statement, "This proves not that 9 was written at Werden . . ."<sup>4</sup>

Of somewhat greater importance are the incompleteness and occasional inaccuracy of palaeographical descriptions or judgments. The fact that "a form of the question mark is used" in a twelfth-century MS (69) is not significant; what matters is the exact nature of the form. Does "ordinary *a*" on page 103 mean the minuscule letter of the uncial type? It is extremely doubtful whether "the frequent use of the older form *ae*, even where *e* is correct, may indicate a Merovingian exemplar" (82). Again, two of the illustrations given on page 133 (*adplene* for *adprime* and *putribus* for *putridis*) hardly "bear out" the supposition that the archetype was written in rustic capitals. Moreover, the traits of MS 30 (289: the double-c form of *a*, the assimilated *ti* ligature with the downstroke extending far below the line, looped *o*, and the use of high *e* in ligatures) are, with the possible exception of the *ti* ligature, by no means exclusively Beneventan; they are characteristic of Merovingian and other pre-Caroline scripts as well. Finally, the discussion on pages 470-1 of the note on fol. 60<sup>v</sup> of *Berlin lat. 791* needs clarification. Is this note contemporary with the note on fol. 1<sup>r</sup> or possibly in the same hand? The statement that the manuscript "was certainly at Werden by the eleventh century" is unfounded.

It is my opinion that as the investigation proceeds the authors would profit from a more scientific palaeographical description of their key manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> They ought to seek the dimensions of the space occupied by the script (and not merely the dimensions of the MS); the rulings; the prickings; the number and character of the hands; and full information concerning abbreviations, ligatures, capitals, and ornamentation. Many of these details could be discovered in the available repro-

ductions; others would appear only in the manuscripts themselves. Despite the war a start could be made now.

Further descriptions or evaluations of six of the manuscripts discussed in the present work are provided by competent palaeographers whose works have not been included in the present discussion: Albert Bruckner, whose *Scriptoria Medii Aevi Helvetica*, III (Geneva 1938) 109, fully describes MSS 83 and 84, and F. M. Carey, whose article, "The Scriptorium of Reims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar," in L. W. Jones, ed., *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand* (New York 1938) 59, calls MS 12 "of doubtful Reims provenience 882-900 A.D." (not Fleury in 9/10 s.), and MSS 77h, 77q, and 78h "Reims, 1000-1100 A.D."<sup>6</sup>

Though the present studies are characterized as "little more than a preliminary and partial survey of a broad field" (548), they constitute an essentially firm foundation. May their modest and competent authors soon have the opportunity to bring their arduous work to an end.

LESLIE WEBBER JONES

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

**Temple Treasures.** A Study Based on the Works of Cicero and the Fasti of Ovid. By ANNA HENWOOD GRIFFITHS. xvii, 138 pages. Philadelphia 1943 (University of Pennsylvania Dissertation)

This monograph is a useful study of the works of art and other treasures preserved in certain temples in Rome, Southern Italy, Sicily and Greece. The limitation of the subject indicated by the sub-title is explained by the author's note that treasures mentioned by other Latin writers will be treated in subsequent dissertations, and thus the value of this monograph is partly that of a 'membrum corporis.' The book comprises a careful and thorough collection of the available source material, with the author's interpretation of the sources supplemented by use of archaeological evidence and of commentary by modern scholars. Full quotation of sources in the footnotes makes it convenient to use, though some readers will wish that it had been possible to have the notes at the bottom of each page. The arrangement of material follows, within each chapter, the alphabetical order standardized by the indispensable Topographical Dictionary of Platner-Ashby, to which this and others of the projected group of dissertations will be a valuable supplement.

The word "treasure" has very sensibly been broadly interpreted to include not only works of art and dedicatory offerings but public records, treaties, decrees and

<sup>4</sup>A similar lack of precision appears in the treatment of MS 70, whose date is listed as both "tenth century" (136) and "before the tenth century" (137).

<sup>5</sup>Professor Oldfather (7, note 7, and page 17) is well aware that catalogue descriptions, on which he has in many cases been forced to rely, are notoriously inadequate and often incorrect.

<sup>6</sup>Not respectively "at Reims," "Saint-Thierry," and "from the Reims chapter."



standards of weight. The four chapters vary widely in content and in interest, as is inevitable in the nature of the material available. The two chapters on temples in Rome are naturally the richest both in sources and supplementary material from archaeology and art, while the two short chapters on temples in Southern Italy, Sicily and Greece offer, beyond the evidences of the sources, only occasional interpretations and some citation of numismatic material. In the chapters on temples in Rome, likewise, the different sections vary in interest according to the abundance of literary and archaeological evidence. Particularly interesting and valuable sections are those dealing with the Temples of Jupiter Capitolinus, Magna Mater and Vesta, where the discussion draws upon literary sources, coins and works of art, and upon the vast amount of scholarly discussion which has accumulated about the more famous Roman temples.

It is perhaps the intention of serving as a supplement to the Topographical Dictionary which has made the author somewhat restrained in stating her own estimates of varying opinions of earlier scholars whom she cites. This hesitation to pronounce judgment on conflicting theories makes her at times stop short of a conclusion which seems to the reviewer entirely justified by the evidence. For example, on page 7, after citing various readings of the corrupt passage of Pliny which states that Volca of Veii (?) made the cult statue of Jupiter Capitolinus, she concludes, on general probability, that the artist was more likely to have come from Veii or Fregene in Etruria than from the Volscian town of Fregellae. But she declines to decide between Veii and Fregene, though abundant evidence in archaeological finds of Rome's close connections with Veii make it the more likely choice. The same reluctance to decide between conflicting opinions in another instance leads the reader to a definitely wrong impression. In the discussion of the statue of Mars by Scopas, the author cites in some detail the various early theories on the identification of the statue, apparently accepting the view, held by Gardner and others but now superseded, that the seated deity in one of the "Trajanic" medallions of the Arch of Constantine is a reproduction of Scopas' Mars. A brief reference to Furtwängler's view fails to convey any hint of the more recent studies which have established the date of the medallions as Hadrianic rather than Trajanic and the identification of the seated deity as Hercules (cf. résumé and bibliography cited by E. Strong, *La Scultura Romana*, 218).

There are a few errors, as is inevitable in a work which involves such a multitude of citations. The reviewer has happened upon some minor misprints which will cause no confusion, and two errors which need correction. On page 14 the reference to Livy 7.1.18 is apparently a mistake for 7.8.18; on page 15 the men-

tion of Saglio's explanation of the *clavus* erroneously refers to his comment on the "driving of the nail" in 263 B.C. instead of in 493 B.C. (261 A.D.) at the time of the famous secession of the plebs.

There are occasional points where the discussion could have been carried farther. In the résumé of honors paid to Julius Caesar, in connection with the discussion of his statue in the Temple of Quirinus (29), one misses a reference to the full treatment of the subject in L. R. Taylor's *Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 65ff. In the discussion of the Temple of Fides (4-6), the author draws upon the evidence of imperial coins for the appearance of a statue of the goddess mentioned by Cicero. The inference that representations of the goddess on coins of the imperial period probably preserved the attributes of the earlier statue seems entirely justified. But no notice is taken of the fact that the coins cited show two somewhat different conceptions of Fides. In the early empire she appears with general attributes of prosperity (a cornucopia, patera, heads of grain, or a basket of fruit) and not until the second century do coins begin to represent the Fides Exercituum, whose attribute is a military standard. It seems reasonable to assume that the first of these conceptions more probably reflects the Fides of the republican period. The occurrence of some minor omissions is perhaps implicit in the definitely circumscribed aim of the book, and they do not vitiate its usefulness as a collection and interpretation of the literary and other evidence on temple treasures.

INEZ SCOTT RYBERG

VASSAR COLLEGE

**Greek Temples.** By ISABEL HOOPES GRINNELL. xxi, 60 pages, 54 plates, plans, end maps, cover photograph. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 1943 \$7.50

This book supplies a long-felt need in that it gives in one compass the chief evidence about twenty-five of the important temples built by the ancient Hellenes, and it gives the data clearly and systematically. The "proof of the pudding" is in its usefulness and the reviewer found that, in classes totalling ca. 130 students, this book was the one most sought-after, most used of all the assigned works dealing with Hellenistic architecture. Of course, other books must be consulted for more detail, for variant theories, for other temples and secular buildings, but for a clear and rather complete picture of the twenty-five temples this book appears to date to be unsurpassed.

The author, Mrs. Robert Grinnell, née Miss Isabel Hoopes, is a graduate of Goucher College and for a few years was assistant curator of the Greek and Roman

Department of the Metropolitan Museum. Her indebtedness to William B. Dinsmoor, whose lectures at Columbia she attended, is both acknowledged and to be observed in the book. She has apparently consulted the chief sources in the case of each temple and this rather extensive reading has enabled her to present data and illustrations which are not to be found in the textbooks on Hellenic architecture. In the case of each temple, something is said about the site or setting, about its mythological or legendary, and its historical associations, and sometimes there are bits of human interest which enliven the work. The subsequent history or the fate of each building is given, always an interesting piece of information.

Mrs. Grinnell has transferred her affections and activities from twenty-five temples to a home and two children and so may not be interested in the suggestions and queries which are given below, mainly to elicit further light or a change in text in a future edition. But perhaps the critique may be of value in clearing up some problems, beclouded by differences of opinions, and in bringing about, eventually, a uniform terminology.

Following the Table of Contents is the List of Plates (vii-xiv) which gives the subject of each figure and the source of the illustration. The Introduction (xv-xxi) is in part an epitome of Fowler & Wheeler with some of its illustrations redrawn, and in larger part a discussion of different phases and features of Hellenic architecture. There are also drawings of the Doric and Ionic orders. These drawings as those of the plans of the twenty-five temples are by Mr. Lindsley F. Hall and by their clarity enhance the value and appearance of this book.

Pages 1 to 58 are devoted to the twenty-five temples, which "have been chosen for their beauty and distinction" and "are listed as far as possible in chronological order" (xv). The Temple of Apollo at Thermon leads the list which concludes with the Olympieion at Athens. Of course, there is bound to be a divergence of opinion in selecting an "All-Hellenic" list of twenty-five temples. Someone will miss the so-called Temple of Concord at Akragas. The reviewer would include the Temple of Zeus at Nemea at the cost of omitting the Temple of Hera (E-R) at Akragas or even that of Asklepios at Epidauros. The Temple at Nemea is so important in the study of the evolution (and devolution) of the Doric order because of this temple's slender proportions (column-ratio 1:6.3), the straight profile of the echinus, and the comparatively insignificant capital. (The study of this Temple at Nemea and drawings have been made by Mr. Bert Hodge Hill and will appear in a forthcoming publication.)

In the case of each temple, the name, date, plate numbers are given above the plan of the temple. Below the plan come the order, column-arrangement,

and the dimensions in feet and inches and, in parenthesis, in metres. Then follow the description of the temple and a brief, selected bibliography on this building. The plan is always on a large scale and clear. After a short list of abbreviations, there is a glossary of eighty-six terms and then follow the fifty-four Plates (I-LIV). These plates in collotype are on the whole good but a few are poor, being indistinct and smudged (e.g. XV, B; XLVIII, E). There is a large clear map, white-on-brown, on the double-spread inside both the front and back covers, with the sites of the twenty-five temples located on it. Few other names appear on this map covering an area inclusive of Sicily and Sardes. This welcome addition is also to be credited to Mr. Hall.

The following comments are given, not so much with the idea of reviewing this particular book as with the desire to bring about a generally accepted system of terminology among scholars in the field of Hellenic architecture.

Is 'conglomerate' (xvii, 3) the proper designation of shell-limestone? Conglomerate usually connotes the hard breccia or puddingstone and this was not used for the superstructure of a temple. Was the 'hook-clamp' (xvii) "mostly used in the fourth century"? Though used in this century, was it not typically Hellenistic?

One may question the theory that the colonnade was erected before the cella-building (xviii). The evidence from Aigina and Eggesta do not necessarily point to this. It would be easier and seems more reasonable to build the cella-building first. Doubtless at Eggesta the blocks of the cella-building were pilfered for building material. Note that the stylobate blocks between the columns have been taken away. It would have been easier to tear down the cella-walls, supporting only one end of the coffered beams over the pteroma, if anything, at the time of despoliation, than the exterior entablature and columns. Then, too, wall-blocks would be easier to handle and would be more adaptable for re-use than, say, cornice-blocks or triglyphs.

In the elevations of the Doric and Ionic temples (xvii, xviii) the lower two steps of the three-stepped base are designated as the "stereobate" and in the plan of a typical temple (xv) they are labelled "substructure or stereobate." In the Glossary the stereobate is the "substructure of a temple including the stylobate" (60). But elsewhere this three-stepped base is included in the superstructure. I prefer to follow Dr. L. B. Holland and label the unseen foundation as the stereobate. The euthynteria would then be the top course of the unseen foundation. The three-stepped base may better be called the 'krepidoma.' *Krepis* is the sole, the base of a shoe and so the krepidoma would be a suitable and unambiguous term for the base of a building. Its top course is, of course, the stylobate. There is no need to designate the lower two steps by a special term.

'Superstructure' is used as the part above the columns (xix, line 2), in the plan (xv) by inference the part above the stepped base, but elsewhere correctly as the visible part of the temple. Would not ambiguity be avoided by using the terms: 'stereobate' with euthynteria for the unseen foundations, and 'krepidoma' with stylobate for the three-stepped base and lowest part of the superstructure of a temple?

In the drawing of the Doric Order (xviii) there should not be the line running between the lower edges of the regulae, and an akroterion might have been drawn. Desirable, too, would be the inclusion of the terms 'necking,' 'annulets,' 'corona,' and 'pediment,' especially since these terms are mentioned in the glossary and the text. Would it not be well to drop the use of the term 'geison' in favor of 'cornice' which is the favored word in the text (e.g. p. 13)? Geison is used for what the reviewer would call the cornice proper. Cornice here is not used correctly for it is made to include the sima. The sima is not a part of the cornice; it rests on the cornice but is a separate element and really to be associated with the roof. It is regularly of the same material as the roof-tiles, terracotta in the earliest and marble in the majority of the Hellenistic temples.

In the drawing of the Ionic elevation (xix) the euthynteria is drawn and named; it is omitted in the Doric elevation. Either it should be omitted (as in the Doric elevation) or a dotted line drawn at or near its top to indicate the ground level. As noted above, the term stereobate had best be disassociated from the krepidoma (three-stepped base) and applied to the unseen foundations. The terms krepidoma, torus and trochilus (scotia), echinus, pediment and akroterion might be added and again geison discarded. Since dentils are mentioned in the Glossary, they might have been included; they are described as part of (the bed moulding of) the cornice. However, dentils are usually omitted from the Attic variety of Ionic. Again the sima should not be included as part of the cornice.

One may call attention to only a few points in the main body of the work, which invite query or criticism. The descriptions are adequate and supplemented with comments on the setting and with interesting bits of local lore, religion, and history associated with each temple or site.

The Heraion at Olympia, second in the list, is dated ca. 600 B.C.—in keeping with the modern tendency to lower dates in ancient history. (Hammurabi has come down from ca. 2100 to ca. 1750. The introduction of the Hellenic alphabet has been lowered from the ninth century to ca. 700.) In time, however, we may set back the date of the Heraion at Olympia to ca. 650 B.C. Welcome would be a drawing of the various Heraion capitals, arranged in chronological order, showing the development from the flanging curve to the straight profile of the echinus.

In the case of the Old Athena Temple at Athens, the author follows Dinsmoor in the plausible theory that the west part was rebuilt after 479 and became the State bank, the Opisthodomos of the inscriptions.

Because two or three columns of the north peristyle of the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina were built up of drums and were not monolithic as were the other columns, it is suggested that this is "perhaps an argument in favor of the theory that the colonnade was finished first" and thus "space would be left for carting materials into the interior" (17). This seems unlikely, first, because monolithic columns could have been erected to fill the gap just as easily as drums; secondly, it seems to the reviewer, who has spent many days and one night at the temple, that the material would have been worked and stacked in the broad area by the south side of the Temple of Aphaia and thence carried directly into the temple from the south. On the whole, there is lacking conclusive evidence that the colonnade was finished before the cella-building. On the contrary, it seems reasonable to hypothecate, if not to state, that the reverse procedure was followed. In justice to the author, it must be said that she merely presents this theory as one that has been suggested. Incidentally, a photograph, taken from a few feet farther west, would have shown the asymmetrically placed doorway between the cella and opisthodomos (Pl. XVI, D).

On page 25 occurs the only striking typographical error, where the architect of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia appears as "Lisbon" instead of Libon. (This brings to mind the only connection between Hellas and Portugal known to the reviewer, namely the song celebrating the "Portuguese and the Greeks.")

The author follows Dinsmoor in the dating of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai, "about 450-420 B.C.," and quotes his suggestion that "perhaps Iktinos, the architect, came to the Peloponnese with Pheidias (with whom he afterwards executed the Parthenon)" and that, while Pheidias worked on the great statue of Zeus at Olympia, Iktinos designed this temple (31). Elsewhere (35, n. 9) it is remarked that the inferiority of the Ionic features at Bassai as compared with those of the Parthenon is due to the fact that Iktinos did not have Kallikrates, the co-architect of the Parthenon, associated with him at Bassai.

There is not universal agreement with regard to the date and the architect of the temple at Bassai. Some, including Miss Richter, think that not until after he had won fame by his work on the Parthenon was Pheidias commissioned to create the chryselephantine Zeus at Olympia, i.e. after 432. And the story that Iktinos was architect at Bassai Holland believes was invented by the local guide to impress Pausanias, that a Hellene from Asia Minor was the architect, and that the temple was built in the late fifth, or even early fourth, century.



The plan of the Hephaisteion (32) lacks the interior columns. (They appear in Dinsmoor's plan in *Hesperia*, Supp. V 1941.) It might be mentioned that the lowest step of the krepidoma was of poros (limestone) and not just the "foundations" (our 'stereobate'). And is not the west pediment framed by raking cornices and horizontal cornice of Parian marble? Following Kjellberg, the author writes, "The frieze at the west was perhaps influenced by the Parthenon metopes" (33 and n. 6). Possibly, but this subjective critique, based on stylistic grounds, may at first sight seem unsound because of chronological considerations, if one thinks of the metopes exerting their influence while in situ on the Parthenon. If the Hephaisteion is dated ca. 449-4, its frieze could hardly have been carved later than 445, though possibly 444. The Parthenon metopes were probably not set in place before 444 or even 443. However, the author writes elsewhere (35) that the metopes of the Parthenon, dated on stylistic grounds from ca. 447 to 443, "were carved on the ground, perhaps in Pheidias's workshop." Thus one must think of the metopes, directly or through their artist(s), influencing the Hephaisteion frieze while they were on the ground or stowed or displayed in the workshop near the Parthenon—if Kjellberg's theory is to be followed.

Naturally the Parthenon receives more than usual space, four pages and four plates. This is partially due to the attention given to the sculpture. (Where present or prominent, space is devoted to the sculptural decoration of other temples also.) The English edition of Hege and Rodenwaldt, *The Akropolis*, might also be mentioned (34, n. 1). It is perhaps quibbling to question the use of the term "statuette" for the six-foot figure of Nike held by the Athena Parthenos (35). But peplos would be a better term than "tunic" and appears in the glossary (60). However, this Latinism is more than compensated for by the welcome Hellenic forms of names throughout this work. It is gratifying for the Philhellene to see that Aphaia, Iktinos, and Pheidias and other Hellenes have not been carried off captive to Italy to have their names Latinized. The reviewer would prefer Korinth to Corinth but we do read Bassai and Sounion.

The theory of the priority of the colonnade in construction is merely presented, not urged, in connection with the Temple of Athena at Eggesta (40). The absence of the re-used material in the vicinity of Eggesta (later Segesta) does not militate against the suggestion (v. supra) that the blocks of the cella-building (as well as the stylobate blocks between the columns) here were used as a quarry. Wall-blocks were transported from Troy as far as Lesbos by Archainax in the sixth century B.C.

One might insert "ugly terracotta" before "copies" in speaking of the slabs of the north frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike which were substituted for the marble part carried off by Lord Elgin. What a noble gesture it

would be for the British to show their appreciation of the immeasurable aid given them by the modern Hellenes in World War II by returning to the Akropolis this frieze, and also the "absent sister" (as a Greek folksong calls the missing Karyatid) of the Erechtheion, but above all the north column of the east portico of the Erechtheion. The delay caused by the Greeks' resistance to the invader will prove to have been one of the decisive actions of World War II. Well, at least a reviewer should be allowed a "wild" dream.

The parapet of the Athena Nike Temple continued on the south side, not to "the wall of the Propylaia" (43), but to the Late Helladic Cyclopean wall.

The Argive Heraion is a case of a temple chosen for its distinction, namely its legendary associations, the cult-statue by Polykleitos, and the fact that it was excavated by the American School.

One day on the Akropolis, the reviewer heard a member of a New York architectural firm remark, "That building disobeys many a law of architecture and yet gets away with it!" with reference, of course, to the Erechtheion. This building of many problems and more controversies has been given a lucid description by the author, who subjoins a rather extensive bibliography on the Erechtheion. It seems unfortunate that the monumental publication of this building by the American School should appear as Horace and Hadrian called it, *The Erechtheum*. And yet, Hadrian was wont to speak Greek during his long sojourns in Athens and doubtless he called it by its Hellenic name.

The Temple of Asklepios is of interest especially from the point of view of cult and history and possibly culture. Architecturally it lacks the importance of the Nemean temple. Yet because of its interesting associations, I would be inclined to omit some other temple, e.g. Temple E-R at Akragas, and keep this on the list of twenty-five. Furthermore, it appears to be the only temple which was plundered for its building material by pirates! (50).

In connection with the Temple of Artemis at Sardes, should not one read "Northwest" for "Northeast" on Plate L, B? The Peisistratid Olympieion at Athens is said to have been started about 515 B.C. and probably as a Doric temple. Some have thought it was Ionic, and Dinsmoor has elsewhere dated the laying of the axis on April 3, 521 B.C.

Following the Key to Abbreviations is a glossary of eighty-six terms (59-60), some of which call for comment or query. 'Pediment' is probably the only important term omitted. 'Krepidoma' is, of course, missing here because stereobate has (unfortunately!) been used in its stead.

Akrolithic is also used of a statue of marble with limestone or a poorer grade of marble (as well as of a statue of marble and wood). The metopes of Temple E-R at Akragas might have been called akrolithic (20).

**Annulet.** Instead of "one of the fillets at the lower part of the Doric capital," I would suggest "Each of the fillets, etc. . . ." Trivial, but I was asked by an interested student, "Which one?" And are not the annulets at the lower part of the Doric echinus? The lower part of the Doric capital is the necking which is below the annulets.

**Astragal.** Is this not applicable also to the "Bead-and-Reel" moulding?

**Cornice** is used here to include the cornice proper (geison here) and the sima. But, as noted above, the sima is essentially a distinct member and to be associated with the roof.

Dentils are said to be "in the bed molding of an Ionic or Corinthian cornice." It should be added here (or on p. xix) that the dentils were sometimes omitted, for the students look in vain for dentils on the drawing on page xix. Originally and functionally, the dentils were distinct from the cornice and might better be treated as a separate element which may be omitted, as it usually is in the Attic version of Ionic. A small point but mentioned here because of questions asked in class.

**Entablature:** "The superstructure . . . resting on the columns." Emend to "That part of the superstructure etc." Below, the superstructure is rightly taken as the visible part of the temple, i.e. the temple proper consisting of krepidoma (base), columns, and entablature.

**Euthynteria:** It is the "controlling" or, as here, the "leveling" course. It is hardly accurate to describe it as a "course which connects the buried foundations with the visible superstructure of a building." It is essentially the carefully levelled platform on which the temple is constructed and from which the measurements in elevation are taken. It is the top course of the unseen foundations (our 'stereobate'). Theoretically it is unseen, but actually it does project a few inches above ground, as a rule.

**Geison**, the Greek word, is in this work used instead of the term cornice, the true cornice, i.e. the projecting undercut member with bed-molding, mutules with guttae on its soffit, and corona, its vertical face. In the text, cornice is used in the (to the reviewer) correct sense.

**Necking:** "The upper part of the shaft of a column, just below the capital, often with one or more grooves." Is it not in the Doric order rather the fluted part or fluted base of the capital? It *seems* a part of the shaft but is actually separated from the top drum of the shaft by the groove called hypotrachelion. (The necking is also called by its Greek name, the *trachelion*). The grooves, a decorative feature suggested by the hypotrachelion (occasioned by the bevelling of the arrises of the capital), may appear both above and below the original groove, the hypotrachelion. All this applies to the Doric necking. In the Ionic order, the necking is part of the shaft, the break between shaft and capital

coming between the carved echinus and the bead-and-reel moulding at the top of the shaft.

**Podium.** Perhaps one might add "with vertical sides" after the word "pedestal." One thinks of the Mausoleion, the Lysikrates Monument, and Roman temples in association with the word podium.

**Pseudodipteral** may also have an inner row of engaged columns as well as "with the inner row of columns omitted," but the former is Roman and may be omitted in a work limited strictly to 25 Hellenic temples. The term trochilus might be given as a variant of scotia, the "concave molding used in the base of the Ionic order." Stereobate may better be supplanted by krepidoma in its use here as the three-stepped base of a temple.

A valuable addition, which might come immediately before the plates, would be about four pages devoted exclusively to the plans of all the temples, drawn to the same scale. Thus one would at a glance recognize the comparative sizes of the temples and note how much larger the Parthenon is than the temple at Bassai, how the Artemiseion at Ephesos exceeds the measurements of the Olympieion, etc. This suggestion comes as a result of an oft-expressed wish of Dr. Leicester B. Holland.

This review has been lengthy partly because of the statement at the back of the book that only "1000 copies of this book were printed in August, 1943." Such a valuable and interesting book will have to run into another edition. Mayhap some comment in this review may be worth incorporating or some definition may be clarified or expanded.

But this review has as its aim not only to review and bring to the notice of teachers and laymen an excellent work on one branch of Hellenic architecture, but also to draw the attention of archaeologists and instructors of architecture to the need of devising an accepted, uniform system of terminology, particularly in the field of Hellenic architecture. A comparison of several standard works on architecture will soon convince one of this need. The varied, often inaccurate, use of terms is confusing to a student and not conducive to accuracy and clarity in publications by a scholar.

The numerous queries and suggested alterations, additions, and excisions must not be taken as a reflection against the book under review. Rather it was the excellence of the book, proved in the classroom, that led an enthusiastic reviewer to give so much attention to the opus. Had it not been so superior, it would not have elicited this meticulous critique.

Mrs. Grinnell is to be congratulated on producing such a book, a work which for years will constitute a sine qua non for everyone, student or layman, interested in learning about Hellenistic architecture, and few teachers of the subject will be content to be without it.

J. PENROSE HARLAND

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA